## 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Plaintiff, v.  STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT FILED  DEC 19 2014  Defendant.  Defendan	United States of America,	Case No. CR 14-565 LB
Defendant.  Defendant.  Defendant.  Sor the reasons stated by the parties on the record on \( \frac{2}{7.2} \), 2014, the Court excludes time under \( \frac{1}{120000000000000000000000000000000000		STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT <b>FILED</b>
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED:	For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from(7-/19, 2014 to) the continuance outweigh the best interest of the purpose of	DEC 19 2014  RICHARD W. WIEKING  NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT  12 / 19 , 2014, the Court excludes time under HEORNIA  2015 and finds that the ends of justice served ablic and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED:		e likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED:  LAUREL BEELER  United States Magistrate Judge	defendants, the nature of the pro or law, that it is unreasonable to expect	secution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial
counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED:  LAUREL BEELER  United States Magistrate Judge		
necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED: LAUREL BEELER  United States Magistrate Judge  STIPULATED:	counsel's other scheduled case commits	nreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
DATED: LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge  STIPULATED:	necessary for effective preparation, taki	
	12419	
	STIPULATED:  Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney